

Serial No. 10/725,877
June 3, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005
Page 6 of 9

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 11. This sheet, which includes Fig. 11, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 11.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet.

Serial No. 10/725,877
June 3, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005
Page 7 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11 and 13-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends Fig. 11 and claims 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-15 and 17, cancels claims 1, 3, 7, 10 and 12 and add new claims 18-23.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims, and that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters which are not mentioned in the description. Applicant has amended Fig. 11 so as to remove reference characters 53, 54 and 55 which are not mentioned in the description. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 9 so as to provide proper antecedent basis for "the parallel inductor" and canceled claims 10 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-8, 10-13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikada et al. (U.S. 6,781,479). Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Kushitani et al. (U.S. 6,608,534). Claims 1, 13, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by Noguchi et al. (U.S. 6,489,861).

Applicant has amended claim 15 to be in independent form including all of the features of base claim 1 and intervening claims 2 and 3, and has amended claim 9 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to be in independent form including all of the features of base claim 1 and intervening claim 7.

Serial No. 10/725,877
June 3, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005
Page 8 of 9

In addition, Applicant has canceled claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art rejections of claim 1 are moot, and that claims 9 and 15 are allowable, as indicated by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11 and 13-23 are allowable

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2005


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080